

Remarks

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-9, 14-20, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,652,292 to Pratt (hereinafter "Pratt").

Claim 1 requires "a substrate received in said cavity." Applicant previously noted that "the official action cites circuit board 50 as the substrate, receptacles 20 as openings, and housing 16 as defining a cavity. Circuit board 50 sits atop and across receptacles 20 and is not within housing 16. Accordingly, the cited substrate is not received within the cited cavity." The Examiner responded by stating that "The cavity is formed through the top of housing 16, within the cavity is a platform 54 on which circuit board 50 is located, by visual inspection of Fig. 3 we note that when the circuit board is on platform 54, it is within the cavity formed in the housing 16." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Official Action's visual inspection of Fig. 3 of Pratt. A visual inspection of Fig. 3 fails to definitively show the height of platform 54 with respect to the outer wall of housing 16. More importantly, claim 1 also requires that "at least one opening therethrough for communication with said cavity." The Official Action cites receptacles 20 as the openings and state that "The cavity is formed through the top of housing 16." The Official Action appears to equate the claimed openings and cavity. As claimed, the openings and the cavity are distinct pieces in communication with each other, not one that is the same piece as or a sub part of the other.

Additionally, applicant previously noted that claim 1 requires "second portions [of the header electrical terminals] ... [and] said substrate forming an electrical and mechanical connection therewith... wherein said mechanical connection at least partially retains said connector header and substrate to said casing." In response to Applicant's previous response, the Official Action states "the header, terminals, and circuit board comprise a single unit connected primarily through the press fit connection of the terminals to the circuit board, therefore when the lower ends of the terminals are inserted through elements 46, 48, and 44 the terminals are aiding in the retention of the substrate (50) and header (12) to the casing (16)." As shown in Fig. 5, and acknowledged by the Official Action, the electrical and mechanical connection between the terminals and the circuit board is already present in Fig. 5. Furthermore, the substrate 50 and header 12 are coupled to each other but not to the casing 16 in Fig. 5. The mechanical coupling of the substrate 50 to the header 12 is independent of their coupling to casing 16. Accordingly,

the mechanical connection between the terminals and the substrate fails to "at least partially [retain] said connector header and substrate to said casing."

For at least the above reasons, Applicant believes that the proposed rejection of claim 1 is improper and respectfully requests its withdrawal. Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and requires "said casing is defined by a planar wall and upstanding peripheral walls, said opening extending through said planar wall, and said peripheral walls forming said cavity." The claimed construction is not consistent with the Official Action's construction stating that "the cavity is formed through the top of housing 16." The only parts that are formed through the top of housing 16 are receptacles 20 which have been identified by the Official Action as the openings. Accordingly, the interpretation of Pratt used in claim 1 cannot read on claim 2. Claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and requires "a seal member positioned within said sealing groove and in sealing contact with said sealing wall." In rejecting claim 7, the Official Action stated "the connector header has a sealing groove (Fig. 5, the groove between elements 38 and 36)." Then, in rejecting claim 8, the Official Action stated "Pratt teaches a seal member (Fig. 5, element 36) positioned within said sealing groove." Having element 36 define a side of the sealing groove as stated in rejecting claim 7 is inconsistent with having element 36 then be within the sealing groove as stated in claim 8. The definition of element 36, or 38 as the sealing member is further inconsistent with the rejections made with respect to claim 14, as discussed below. Accordingly, claim 8 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and requires "said connector header has a mounting surface which extends at least partially into said opening." The Official Action states that "Pratt teaches that the header has a mounting surface (Fig. 5, element 38) which extends at least partially into said opening." In rejecting claim 1, the Official Action cited receptacle 20 as the opening. Element 38, the now cited mounting surface, fails to extend at least partially into receptacle 20. Accordingly, claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

As previously noted, Claim 14, similarly to claim 1, requires "positioning a substrate in said cavity." As discussed above, a visual inspection of Fig. 3 fails to definitively show the height of platform 54 with respect to the outer wall of housing 16. Additionally, claim

14 requires "providing a sealing member between said casing and said header which is compressed in the mating direction." The official action states, that element 38 is the proper element that reads on "the sealing member," and that "with this correction, it becomes evident that simply due to gravitational forces element 38 is compressed between the header and the casing." A reading of Pratt col. 3, ll. 41-49 shows that peripheral flange 38 is a part of header connector 12. Accordingly, flange 38 cannot be compressed between the header (of which it is a part) and the casing. Furthermore, the argument is inconsistent with statements made in the Official Action with respect to claims 9 and 20, stating that element 38 is part of the header and with respect to claims 8 and 18, stating that the header includes a groove defined between elements 36 and 38. For at least the above reasons, Applicant believes that the proposed rejection of claim 14 is improper and respectfully requests its withdrawal. Claims 15-26 depend from claim 14 and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Additionally, claim 15 includes the limitation that "a mechanical connection between said header and said substrate retains said connector header and substrate to said casing." This limitation is similar to one present in claim 1. The arguments put forth above with respect to that limitation are repeated here with respect to claim 15.

Claim 19 includes the limitation of "said seal member is positioned within said sealing groove." Such a limitation is similar to the limitation of claim 8. The arguments put forth above with respect to that limitation are repeated here with respect to claim 19.


Claim 20 requires that "said connector header is provided with a mounting surface which extends at least partially into said opening and is placed in contact with said substrate." The Official Action cites element 38 as the mounting surface. As noted with respect to claim 9, element 38 fails to extend into the opening. Furthermore, element 38 fails to contact the substrate. Accordingly, claim 20 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejections under §103, all so rejected claims depend from an independent claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If necessary, Applicants request that this response be considered a request for an extension of time appropriate for the response to be timely filed. Applicants request that any required fees needed beyond those submitted with this response be charged to the account of Baker & Daniels, Deposit Account No. 02-0390.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below should any question or comment arise during consideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Ryan C. Barker
Reg. No. 47,405

BAKER & DANIELS
300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Telephone: (317) 237-8690
Fax: (317) 237-1000